I:Gurdon E-4, 9 (no date) 1907 AR? Khasi AR?

923 prominent town on the boundary line, or by natural boundaries such as streams.

92] 64 In the *War* country to the West of Cherra, notably the country between the heights of Laitkynsew and the plains, considerable portions of the hill-sides are the property of communities known as *eings*. A *eing* may be defined as a collection of families sprung from some common ancestress or ancestor. As an instance of these *eings* I may describe the community known as the *lai eing* which owns land in the neighbourhood of Laitkynsew, the area owned being known as the "*ri lai eing*," or land of the three clans. These clans are descended from three men, U Kyrta, U Nalein, and U Tangsi, it being remarkable that in this case descent is traced originally from male ancestors and not from females. The three ancestors are said to have owned a large tract of land, and they had as their abode the village of Laitmawrin close to Laitkynsew; but owing to an epidemic, or some such cause, they deserted the village of Laitmawrin and went with their families to live in some of the surrounding *War* villages, viz. in Tynna, Nongkseh, Nongwar, Mawsh, and Mawlong. The descendants of the three men above-mentioned possess a genealogical table, showing their descent from the original three founders of the *eings*. They claim a large tract of country lying to the south and south-east of the Laitkynsew plateau, containing not only *eings* gardens, but also valuable lime quarries. There are other *eing* communities also in the neighbourhood, e.g. the *kiewiew phew eing*, or sixty *eings*, who put forward claims to other tracts of land. The boundaries of the *ri lai eing* are identifiable on the ground. [203] The business of the *eing* community is managed by a doctor, an elder or other influential person being chosen as president.

923 In the country of the Lyngngam the crop belongs to the person who cultivates it, but the land belongs to the *kur* or family. The Lyngngam villages, like those in the Khasi Nongkhlaw, do not pay any rent to the State. If outsiders cultivate within the areas set apart for the different Lyngngam villages, all of them, including women, have to pay eight annas each to the people of the village in whose circle they cultivate. There is usually a mutual understanding between inhabitants of Lyngngam villages that certain tracts of land belong to the

she does not have any daughter, the property will pass to the female descendants of sisters of Ka Long, as her elder sisters Ka Laisum and Ka Laiban have left no daughters. It is therefore necessary to distinguish carefully between an elder and a younger sister, and also similarly between sisters of the mother. The preservation of the women of the same house and ancestral family requires to be noted with care.

The youngest daughter and heiress is termed the Ka Khadduh. As Gurdon remarks the "Ka Khaddah is the custodian of the family property, not the full heir in the sense known to other systems of law, but a limited heir. She is responsible for the performance of religious ceremonies..... she remains her mother, and if she be Ka Khaddah of the whole family, she puts the bones of all members in their final resting place under the stone (mawbah) of the clan. The expenses of this ceremony are considerable and for this reason she gets a larger share of property, or in some cases a piece of family property in addition and apart from her separate share. Members of the family who are unable to earn for themselves and have no children to earn for them have the right of being fed at the ing Khaddah" (house of the heiress).

The management of the property is however vested in the men of the family. The ancestral property of the family of appellant U Subu K...'s mother was under the management of U Joi, in his mother's life-time; then, on the death U Joi, the next brother U Doi became manager. After U Doi, the management came to U Subu Kai. After him, the authority will pass to U Hajan, as U Synkhurai is dead and then to U Nadem. Any sons of Ka Pyn and other sisters will not get any precedence over U Nadem. As the senior U Kai of the Iaughiah Kur, U Subu Kai is also the manager of the common property of the Kur. This land has been leased out to various persons and the total income is divided among the different houses of the Kur. Whenever there is money to be distributed U Subu Kai calls together all the representatives of the Iaughiah houses and

exception. As I pointed out in the last chapter on the Garo, private ownership started with wet cultivation. In Kongkan, there are no common (village) or clan land: every piece of land is owned by some household—more precisely it is owned by the woman, the head of a household, and managed by her brother or maternal uncle. The majority of households in Kongkan possesses land. Some of the richer households lend the land while some of the poorer households have it. The rate for loans is Rs. 30/- per year for an area where one maund (80 lbs.) of millet seeds can be sown. As there is no acreage system, the measurement is by quantity of seeds, and since shifting cultivation requires a change of field every year, the rent is fixed by the year. The parental gardens, also privately owned, are never leased. When labour is required, the owner engages villagers, paying them Rs. 3/- per day.

In Sohkynduh, there are some lands called "clan land." Throughout the history of the formation of Sohkynduh village, as reconstructed from my data, can be traced some evidence of the evolution of land ownership. The first inhabitants of Sohkynduh were said to be the people belonging to the Pyrtun clan (See Lists 6 and 7). It seems that when the Pyrtun came to this site, the land already belonged to the Dkhar clan of Kynmai village, five miles north of Sohkynduh. The present distribution of land ownership confirms this story. The *jhum* field belonging to Sohkynduh is divided into four sections according to the locality:

1. Lum Sohkynduh	3. Sohliang
2. Mawkhaia	4. Lumpaiong

One part of Lum Sohkynduh belongs to the Pyrtun clan. The rest of Lum Sohkynduh, Sohliang and Mawkhaia belong to the Dkhar clan of Kynmai village, the management of which is in the hands of Phrosung who came from Kynmai and married a woman of Sohkynduh. Lumpaiong is owned by Sor (Kynshah clan, 32 of List 6) privately. The Pyrtun and Dkhar lands are used by their descendants respectively. The people of other clans have to pay a rent of Rs. 80/- to use these clan lands. For the land which belongs to Sor, even the people of the same clan (Kynshah) have to pay rent since this land is privately owned. Thus the land of Sohkynduh belongs partly to particular clans and partly to a private owner.

Gordon explains the existence of the clan land in the Khasi Hills as follows:

"The clan lands originally, when population was sparse, were owned by families, but as the members of the family increased and a clan was formed, the lands became the property of the clan instead of the family. Such clan lands are properly demarcated by stone boundary marks. The manager of the clan

workers and they were few in number.[1] They were particularly employed to work hard in the clearing of jungle for new jum gardens in summer.

In the orange season (December to February) the number of workers increased and they were paid more. Rs. 1.8 were paid for one load (one person carrying 80 pounds of oranges, from an orange garden to the railway station--about two miles). Usually a worker made three to five trips a day. Many workers from Jaintia used to come for this particular season.

Some permanent workers were engaged for wet rice fields. They were usually Khasis cultivators since these Khasi and other tribes do not know the technique of wet cultivation, plains people like the Bihares immigrants were engaged. These workers were provided with servants' quarters where they lived with their wives and children. However, very few Jaintiya households possessed wet fields.

The economic prosperity of Jaintiya reached its climax during the period from 1939 to 1941. Since 1941, the orange production has been decreasing. In 1943, a serious disease attacked the orange gardens as well as the jum-land gardens. Besides, by depriving Jaintiya, as it had Sylhet, of their most important markets, Dacca and Sylhet, the Partition of India and Pakistan in 1947 caused a serious economic depression in the whole region. On the other hand, because of the past prosperity, the population has rapidly increased during the last ten years. The serious economic condition of Jaintiya is illustrated in the petition which was submitted by the Jaintiya people when the Governor of Assam visited there area in January 1956. It runs thus:

"Since the last ten years or so, with the increase of population in the village and with the loss of fertility of the soil, the people were faced with economic depression. At present they are facing acute shortage of land they have also no scope to adopt other forms of cultivation like jhooming and wet rice cultivation, etc. Moreover, there has been successive attack of Bright's disease which destroyed and wiped out all the orange and jum gardens. And as such, majority of the families have to depend for their livelihood on daily wages.

It is indeed a serious situation for them, because the Khasi do not produce staple foods, such as rice; they economy is completely dependent on the trade of their products by which they purchase their main provisions, clothes, etc. Other people round Jaintiya, being jhum cultivators, can at least get rice and cotton; the minimum requirements, staple foods and clothing are available even in the worst conditions, so that they can at least maintain themselves though the standard of living is low. As I stated before, a few households in Jaintiya possessed rice fields, but the majority had none. Recently they rented some plots of jhum field for rice cultivation from Zemi-Naga of neighbouring villages.[2] However, its yield was but a small percentage of their consumption. A few

1. If they had worked in the gardens of Jaintiya, they might have got more profit than from their own jhum fields. For one day's labour, they got Rs. 6. For one month, they could earn Rs. 13 with which they could buy about 4.5 maunds of rice (one maunds paddy cost Rs. 3-4). For one year it became 52 maunds, which was impossible to produce in a jhum field by a single person's labour.

2. These rates, including the figures of note 1, apply to 1956.

3. Jaintiya villagers told me that Zemi-Naga were kind enough to lent them their field for a negligible rent, though they had not enough for themselves. Zemi-Naga said that they owed much to Jaintiya in the past, so that now they sympathised with the condition of Jaintiya, and offered some parts of their jhum land.

TABLE C-1

Classification of Predominantly Agricultural Localities

Type	Rural area			Urban area			Total		
	No. of localities			No. of localities			No. of localities		
	Localities having fluctuating population	Localities having stable population	Total	Localities having fluctuating population	Localities having stable population	Total	Localities having fluctuating population	Localities having stable population	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Predominantly marketing ...	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	... ...	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	... ...	... ...	... ...
2. Chief cultivators (main, big, off and part of source of rural trade).	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
3. Livestock breeding, fodder (main off and part of source of rural trade).	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
4. Poor season and good season (including fluctuation in the case of both) of part of Rural trade.	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
5. Local or agricultural labourers	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Total ...	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)

[illegible] from private lands (e.g. lands mortgaged to a family and land purchased through assistance by District Council) have been considered as 'land owned' for the purpose of the survey. Income results take in view from landowners only those lands which are possessed by the same as private land or through ordinance through District Council. A perusal of table C.1 given above will show that proportion of workers are higher in those subdivisions which is due to the existence in the subdivisions of some big landholders who are known as zamindars. Majority of the families shown against 'non-cultivating owner' are in fact agricultural labour families who also possess some land but due to some reason or other left it uncultivated. Among owner cultivators, owners and permanent and permanent tenants are those who enjoy income & derived from agricultural labour. Consideration of these two facts along with the number of landless agricultural families goes to show that the proportion of agricultural labourers in the district is rather high.

TABLE C.10

Occupational distribution of families whose principal occupation is other than agriculture

Principal occupation	No. of families					
	Rural area		Urban area		General area	
	Total	P.C. to total	Total	P.C. to total	Total	P.C. to total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Non-agricultural labour.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
2. Textiles, petroleum, etc.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
3. Trades	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
4. Small scale manufacturing & handicraft.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5. Poultry & dairy farming.	[illegible]	[illegible]	..	..	[illegible]	[illegible]
6. Others	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	..	..
Total ..	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE [illegible]

Village group	No. of [illegible]	Total area of holding (acres)	No. of [illegible]	Rent [illegible] (acres)	No. of [illegible]	Area cultivated (acres)	Rent [illegible]	Percentage to col. 8
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. Border area	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
2. Project area	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
3. General area	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Thus it is seen that of the unused land as least 35 per cent in Border area, 16 per cent in Project area and 11 per cent in General area were left fallow.

Considering the number of families, it was found that in Border area villages as many as 86 families had either totally leased out or left fallow their unused land, the corresponding number for Project area and General area being only 9 and 1 respectively.

37

TABLE D-4

Distribution of farms according to size and ownership

Size of farms	No. of farms			
	Wholly owned	Wholly rented	Partly owned and partly rented	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
A. Standard acreage—				
Small farms				
Less than 5 acres	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Medium farms				
5 to less than 10 acres	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Large farms				
10 acres & above	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
B. Irrigated area—				
Small farms				
Less than 5 acres	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Medium farms				
5 to less than 10 acres	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Large farms				
10 acres & above	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

TABLE D-7

Distribution of farms, area by size and type of ownership

Area in acres

Size of farms	Wholly owned	Wholly rented	Partly Owned and partly rented			Total owned area	Total rented area	Total (7+8)
			Owned area	Rented area	Total			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
A. Rural area :—								
Small farms (Less than 5 acres)								
Medium farms (5 to less than 10 acres)								
Large farms (10 acres and above)								
Total								

From the above tables it is evident that in all the areas in each case young south, southern and high, a high proportion of the farms (i.e., as high as 90 per cent in Border area, 80 per cent in Project area and 90 per cent in Control area) is wholly owned and the area covered by these wholly owned farms also constitutes almost similar high proportion (i.e., 80 per cent in Border area, 75 per cent in Project area and 80 per cent in Control area) of the farm area available in the respective village groups. Owned area under all farms amounts to 3238.98 acres (78 per cent of the total farm area) in Border area, 1969.58 acres (82 per cent) in Project area and 1884.62 acres (91 per cent) in Control area. Of this total owned area, in Border area nearly 80 per cent is covered by wholly owned farms and the rest by the partly owned farms. In Project area and Control area respectively 92 per cent and 86 per cent of the total owned area are covered by wholly owned farms. Thus the area available for renting in Border area constitutes 22 per cent of the total farm land area, i.e., 918.18 acres of which 78 per cent is under wholly owned farms and 22 per cent under partly owned farms. In Project area total area available for renting constitutes 18 per cent (i.e., 387.29 acres) of the total farm area of which 92 per cent and 12 per cent respectively are under wholly owned and partly owned farms while in Control area 9.13 per cent (189.96 acres) of the total farm area are available for renting of which respectively 91 per cent and 99 per cent are covered by wholly owned and partly owned farms.

It is seen from Table D-1, that total rented area in Border area, Project area and Control area are respectively 679.92 acres, 193.23 acres and 17.10 acres. A comparison of these figures with the figures of land leased out as in Table D-2 which are respectively 251.82 acres, 91.10 acres and 14.14 acres in the three areas, goes to show that some of the village lands taken in use by the villagers belong to some right-holders who live outside the village.

TABLE 1A-7 (contd.)

B. Periphral areas—										
Small Towns— (less than 5 years)	—	—								
Medium Towns— (5 to 10% (less than 10 years)	—	—								
Large towns— (10 years and above)	—	—								
Total	—	—								
C. General area—										
Small Towns— (less than 5 years)	—	—								
Medium Towns— (5 years to less than 10 years)	—	—								
Large towns— (10 years and above)	—	—								
Total	—	—								

29: Assam G-5 (1950) 296.3 A87 Khasi A87

10.6. Of the total of 799 farms in Border area, 78 per cent were wholly owned, 17 per cent were wholly rented and the remaining 5 per cent were partly owned and partly rented. In Project area, proportions of wholly owned, wholly rented and partly owned and partly rented farms were found to be 73 per cent, 11 per cent and 16 per cent respectively while that in General area were respectively 84 per cent, 4 per cent and 10 per cent of the total number of farms. Of the total farm area, owned area accounted for in Border area 83 per cent, in Project area 85 per cent and in General area 91 per cent of the total farm area in the respective area. Of the total owned area nearly 95 per cent in Border area, 92 per cent in Project area and 90 per cent in General area were covered by wholly owned farms and the rests by partly owned farms. Of the total rented area, in Border area, Project area and General area respectively 91 per cent, 49 per cent and 81 per cent are covered by wholly rented farms.

10.7. Out of 1046 families in Border area, 650, i.e. 62 per cent were indebted, average debt per family being Rs.157·84 nP. and that per indebted family being Rs. 251·25 nP. In Project area out of 643 families 332, i.e., 50 per cent were indebted, average debt per family being Rs. 139·35 nP. and that per indebted family Rs.272·69 nP. In General area out of 104 families, 32, i.e. 29 per cent were indebted, average debt per family being Rs. 50·89 nP. and that per indebted family being Rs. 180·06 nP. of the total indebted families. Predominantly agriculturist families constituted the highest proportion in all the three areas, being 93 per cent in Border area, 77 per cent in Project area and 90 per cent in General area accounting respectively for 97 per cent, 79 per cent and 99 per cent of the total amount of debt in the three areas. Majority of the loans were of small amount inasmuch as in Border area 98 per cent of the loans are of size less than Rs.500·00, average size of these loans being only Rs. 69·25 nP. In Project area 71 per cent and in General area 72 per cent of the loans are of size less than Rs. 200·00, average size of these loans being respectively Rs. 66·60 and Rs. 99·20 only. Of the total number of loans 67 per cent in Border area, 61 per cent in Project area and 90 per cent in General area were of less than 3 years standing. Majority of the loans in Border and Project areas were found to be incurred for productive purposes. In General area 53 per cent of the loans were contracted for maintenance of the family.

Government and other professional and semi-professional money lenders emerged out to be the predominant sources of rural credit. In Border area loans from Government constituted 82 per cent of the total number of loans accounting for 53 per cent of the total amount of loans followed by those from money lenders which worked out as 85 per cent of the total number of loans accounting for 41 per cent of the total amount of loan. In Project area and General area respectively 60 per cent and 78 per cent of the total number of loans accounting for 20 per cent and 34 per cent of the total amount of loan in the respective area were contracted from private money lenders while Government loans constituted in Project area 40 per cent and in General area 17 per cent of the total number of loans accounting respectively for 70 per cent and 61 per cent of the total amount of loan in the respective area.

TABLE D-6.1

Distribution of farms according to size and ownership

Size of farm	Number of farms							
	Wholly owned	Wholly rented	Partly owned and partly rented	Total	Wholly owned	Wholly rented	Partly owned and partly rented	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Border Area								
1. Below 1/2 acre	27 (4·57)	..	—	27 (4·57)	3 (7·69)	3 (7·69)	—	6 (2·38)
2. 1/2 to 1/2 acre	27 (3·92)	1 (0·67)	..	28 (3·85)	—	2 (1·52)	..	2 (0·78)
3. 1/2 to 1 acre	58 (11·20)	..	1 (1·75)	59 (10·68)	2 (7·41)	18 (13·85)	..	20 (7·69)
4. 1 to 2 acres	76 (12·61)	1 (0·67)	3 (2·63)	80 (12·36)	13 (11·30)	20 (15·38)	2 (5·26)	35 (13·21)
5. 2 to 3 acres	50 (12·63)	2 (1·39)	3 (4·23)	55 (12·36)	13 (10·47)	15 (19·48)	6 (15·79)	34 (13·08)
Small Farms	238 (36·82)	5 (3·47)	9 (7·89)	252 (35·08)	37 (28·68)	64 (28·63)	6 (5·77)	107 (28·08)

199

311
423
427

TABLE D-6.1—*contd.*

(1)			(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6. 3 to 5 acres	..	..	86 (18·69)	8 (53·33)	5 (23·81)	99 (39·76)	21 (18·42)	19 (18·81)	6 (22·22)	46 (16·25)
7. 5 to 10 acres	..	..	95 (20·65)	2 (13·33)	6 (28·57)	103 (20·77)	27 (23·68)	24 (21·24)	14 (38·89)	65 (24·71)
Medium Farms	..	..	181 (39·60)	10 (4·93)	11 (5·45)	202 (100·00)	48 (42·40)	43 (38·00)	22 (19·47)	113 (100·00)
8. 10 to 25 acres	..	..	53 (11·52)	1 (6·67)	1 (4·76)	55 (11·08)	26 (22·81)	9 (7·96)	8 (22·22)	43 (16·81)
9. 25 to 50 acres	..	..	4 (0·87)	—	—	4 (0·81)	2 (1·76)	..	—	2 (0·78)
10. 50 and above	..	..	4 (0·87)	..	—	4 (0·81)	1 (0·88)	..	—	1 (0·39)
Large Farms	..	..	61 (13·41)	1 (6·79)	1 (4·80)	63 (100·00)	29 (63·04)	9 (19·57)	8 (17·39)	46 (100·00)
Total:		—	450 (92·74)	15 (3·09)	21 (4·33)	496 (100·00)	114 (43·35)	111 (42·97)	36 (13·68)	261 (100·00)

Project Area									
1. Below 1/3 acre	--	--	1	--	--	1 (0·60)	3	4	--	7 (2·03)
2. 1/3 to 1/2 acre	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	1	--	6 (1·74)
3. 1/2 to 1 acre	--	--	16	--	3	19 (11·23)	9	3	--	12 (3·48)
4. 1 to 2 acres	--	--	30	3	8	41 (24·55)	32	17	9	78 (22·67)
5. 2 to 3 acres	--	--	29	1	4	34 (20·36)	31	14	15	80 (23·26)
Small Farms	--	--	76 (80·00)	4 (4·21)	15 (15·79)	95 (100·00)	120 (65·57)	39 (21·31)	24 (13·12)	183 (100·00)

311 423 427

TABLE D-6.1—*contd.*

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6. 3 to 5 acres -- --	29	...	8	37 (22·16)	55	10	9	74 (21·51)
7. 6 to 10 acres -- --	21	--	4	25 (14·97)	56	3	8	67 (19·19)
Medium Farms .. --	50 (80·65)	--	12 (19·35)	62 (100·00)	111 (78·72)	13 (9·22)	17 (12·06)	141 (100·00)
8. 10 to 25 acres .. --	9	..	1	10 (5·98)	16	2	2	20 (5·81)
9. 25 to 50 acres -- ..	..	..	..	..	..	...	..	..
Large Farms -- --	9 (90·00)	..	1 (10·00)	10 (100·00)	16 (80·00)	2 (10·00)	2 (10·00)	20 (100·00)
Total: --	135 (80·84)	4 (2.40)	28 (16·76)	167 (100·00)	247 (71·80)	54 (15·70)	43 (12·50)	344 (100·00)

General Area

1. Below 1/3 acre	1	...	..	1 (1·11)	1	..	–	1 (1·23)	
2. 1/2 to 1/3 acre	1	–	..	1 (1·11)	..	...	..	..	
3. 1/2 to 1 acre	5	1	...	6 (6·66)	5	..	..	5 (6·17)	
4. 1 to 2 acres	17	1	7	25 (27·79)	12	2	1	15 (18·52)	
5. 2 to 8 acres	18	..	2	20 (22·22)	15	1	1	17 (20·99)	
Small Farms	(79·25)	2 (5·77)	9 (16·98)	53 (100·00)	33 (96·84)	3 (7·89)	2 (5·27)	38 (100·00)	

311
423
427

3/11
1963
Agri

TABLE D-6.1—*concld.*

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6. 3 to 5 acres	25	..	1	26 (28·89)	19	1	1	21 (25·93)
7. 5 to 10 acres	11	..	..	11 (12·22)	10	1	3	14 (17·28)
Medium	36 (97·30)	..	1	37 (100·00)	29 (82·86)	2 (5·71)	4 (11·43)	35 (100·00)
8. 10 to 25 acres	..	..	..	..	7	..	1	8 (9·88)
Large	..	..	..	..	7 (87·50)	..	1 (12·50)	8 (100·00)
Total: ..	72 (88·67)	2 (2·22)	10 (11·11)	90 (100·00)	69 (85·19)	5 (6·17)	7 (8·64)	81 (100·00)

TABLE D-7.1

Distribution of farm area by size and type of ownership

Size of farm	Area in acre: Wholly owned	Wholly rented	Partly owned and Partly rented: Owned area	Partly owned and Partly rented: Rented area	Partly owned and Partly rented: Total	Total owned area (2+4)	Total rented area (3+5)	Total (7+8)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
A. Border area								
1. Small Farms (less than 3 acres).	318.66	85.60	4.78	21.23	4.201	333.44	112.73	446.17
2. Medium Farm (3 to less than 10 acres).	1206.63	263.34	94.31	86.96	181.26	1300.94	350.29	1651.23
3. Large Farms (10 acres and above	1545.28	132.25	59.00	80.25	139.25	1604.28	212.50	1816.78
Total: ..	3070.57 (78.45)	481.09 (12.29)	168.09 (4.20)	194.43 (4.97)	362.52	3238.66 (82.74)	675.52 (17.26)	3914.18 (100.00)

311 423 497

311
423
427

TABLE 19-7.1—*concld.*

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
B. Project area								
1. Small Farms (less than 10 acres).	305.13	59·29	28·47	41·58	70.05	393.59	100.00	434.46
2. Medium Farms (8 to less than 10 acres).	790.56	47·15	59·39	77,21	136.60	849.95	124.36	974.31
3. Large Farms (10 acres and above).	342.77	23·00	35·26	17.00	52.25	360.02	40.00	400.02
Total ...	1420·45 (78·53)	129·44 (7·16)	123·11 (6·81)	135.79 (7.50)	258.90 ..	1543.56 (85.34)	265.23 (14.66)	1808.79 (100·00)
C. General area								
1. Small Farms (less than 3 acres).	126·98	7·25	8,57	9·25	17.82	134·65	16·50	151·15
2. Medium Farms (3 to less than 10 acres).	300·97	8·00	7·73	16·26	28·57	307·80	24·86	332·66
3. Large Farms (10 acres and above).	80·60	..	4·00	8·00	12·00	84·00	8·00	92·00
Total: ...	508·75 (87.90)	15·25 (2·65)	20·30 (3·53)	34·11 (5·92)	54·39	526·45 (91·43)	49·36 (8·57)	575·81 (100·00

20: Hunter G-4 (no date) 1897 AR7 Khasi AR7

435 439 [243] 273 435 at the rate of two or three ears for a farthing; and sugar-cane, the cultivation of which is also very limited, at from a little over a farthing to three-farthings per cane. A fermented liquor called *kadam*, made from rice, is sold at from three-farthings to threepence a quart, according to strength; and a distilled spirit called *phatika*, or *kakiad-kitrak*, at from threepence to fourpence-halfpenny a quart. This latter description of liquor is sometimes made very strong. No records exist by which the present prices of the above articles can [731] be compared with the rates ruling ten years ago. The maximum price of rice during the famine of 1866-67 was 5 *sers* 6 *chhatáks* for the rupee, or about £1 a hundredweight.

804 805 MEASURES, WEIGHTS, ETC.—The Hill people have no proper measurement of time or distance. If there be any standard for measuring distance, it is by the number of *pán* a man chews in the course of a journey, generally about one every half hour. In some parts of the District, land is measured by a stick called *ka dieng-nong*, varying in length from six to seven cubits. Liquids are measured in gourds of different measures, varying from half a *chhaták* to a *ser*, and also in bamboo tubes. Rice, potatoes, beans, etc. are measured in baskets, varying in size in different markets from two to eighty pounds.

805 In the Khásí Hills the inhabitants reckon eight days in the week, named as follows:—(1) Lyn-kah; (2) Nong-krem; (3) Um-long; (4) Rang-hep; (5) Shillong; (6) Pom-tih; (7) Um-nih; (8) Yeo-duh. In the Jáintiá Hills the eight days are named thus:—(1) Kyllao; (2) Pyn-sing; (3) Máo-long; (4) Máo-siang; (5) Máo-shai; (6) Pyn-kat; (7) Thym-blein; (8) Ka-hat. The Khásí months of the year, calculated by moons, are as follow:—(1) U Kylla lynkot; (2) U Rym-pang; (3) U Lyber; (4) U Laiong; (5) U Jimmang; (6) U Jilliw; (7) U Nai-túng; (8) U Nai-lar; (9) U Nai-lúr; (10) U Rysow; (11) U Nai-wing; (12) U Noh-prah.

464 423 LANDLESS LABOURING CLASSES.—There is, and always has been, a large class of labourers in the District who neither rent nor possess any land. Women and children are employed in manual out-door labour of all kinds.

423 [427] VARIETIES OF LAND TENURE can hardly be said to exist. There is nothing whatever resembling the relations between landlord and tenant throughout the Khásí Hills. The lands as a rule are either ancestral property or belong to village communities, and are cultivated under unwritten but well-understood agreements. Of the wide

20: Hunter G-4 (no date) 1897 AR7 Khasi AR7

extent of waste land, some is cultivated in a manner resembling the *jhum* system,—successive crops are grown on a patch of land till the soil is exhausted, and then another spot is selected, where the same process is repeated afresh, but without anything that can be called a *jámid* tenure. Any renting of land is exceptional, and there are no recognised rates of rent. The Deputy-Commissioner, however, states that an ordinary rate for rented land would be from two to three shillings a year for as much land as an individual can cultivate with his own hands.

MANURE is generally used in raising rice and potatoes. It is seldom purchased, the dung and litter of the cattle and other animals about the house being generally utilized for the purpose. For rice fields a little less than half a ton of manure, but for potatoes upwards of two tons, is required per acre. Manure, if purchased, would cost from 2s. 7½d. to 3s. 9d. per acre for rice land, and for potato fields from 12s. to 18s. per acre.

IRRIGATION for agricultural purposes is regularly practised. Water is brought to the land by means of channels cut from the numerous hill streams in the neighbourhood of the fields. Wells and tanks are unknown. The work of irrigation by means of these channels is very easily carried on, and at a very trifling outlay. Rotation of crops is not practised in the Hills.

MODEL FARM.—The Shillong Model Farm, established in 1873, has not proved a success. Experiments tried with wheat give some hope that cold-weather crops may profitably be introduced into the Hills. Two new varieties of potato—'red roughs' and 'pheasant's eye'—were successfully introduced in 1873-74; but these are not looked upon favourably by the Khásiás, as they only give one crop in the year, whereas the ordinary variety yields two crops. Several fruit-trees have been planted out, including apple, pear, cherry, nectarine, and plum; and the tables of the European residents are supplied with vegetables from the garden attached to the farm. A *Manual of Potato Cultivation* compiled by the superintendent has been translated into Assamese, and copies have been distributed among the adjoining Hill tribes. The general failure in all the agricultural experiments is attributed partly to the unfitness of the soil, and still more to the ravages of white ants and other insects peculiar to the Hills. The attempts to improve the indigenous breeds of live stock have been equally unfortunate. During the two years 1874-76 the sum of Rs. 1744